



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/051,578

01/18/2002

Timothy John Massaro

ROC920010314US1

8669

7590

10/26/2005

Steven W. Roth  
IBM Corporation, Dept. 917  
3605 Highway 52 North  
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 10/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/051,578

Applicant(s)

MASSARO

Examiner

Neil Abrams

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 9, 10-15, 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 7, 8, 16, 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

Title should be changed to refer to "Locking covers for cable connectors and data ports". *Other language could be used.*

Claim 1-5 directed to a non elected invention should be cancelled in next response.

Figures 2A objected to, numerals 605, 401, 301 should be added (figure 6).  
Figures 2B, 704, 501, 301 should be added. Abstract, "The latches also serve to obscure fasteners (602,604,702) to prevent tampering" should be added at end.  
Numeral use suggested as disclosure aid.

1. Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Young.
2. Young device, figure 1, includes data cable coupling 101, first member 108, second member 109, and locking mechanism 110 that obscures fasteners 117, 107.  
Claim 13 met by removal of part 108.
3. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young in view of Betzler.
4. Young lacks end portions with holes for a padlock. Betzler figure 31 shows such feature. Obvious to use such items in Young since that device would be easier to manufacture.
5. Claims 6, 10, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Young.

Art Unit: 2839


6. Young figure 4, includes port 316, data cable coupling 101, first member 312 with fastener 307, second member formed by 118, 109 and with fastener 117 and a locking mechanism formed by threaded parts 204, 303, 309 with fasteners 307, 117 obscured in final position when 109 is in place. Since issues may arise, as alternative recited features, such as use of cable for "data" deemed obvious variations. Dependent claims also met by Young as applied above. For claim 18, use of part 113, 115 secures cable to another object. For claim 20, (and 18) also obvious to use second connector at other end of cable of coupling 101 and to use a covering 108, 109 at such other end. This would only be typical cable use with connectors at both ends. Use of cover at second end adds security.

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young in view of Betzler.

8. See above discussion regarding claim 12.

9. Claims 7, 8, 16, 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number 571-272-2089.

  
NEIL ABRAMS  
EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 322